



2d 778, 787 (E.D. Mich. 2004); Rule 8(a), Rules Gov’g § 2254 Cases. Generally speaking, the appointment of counsel in a habeas case is granted only in “exceptional” circumstances, such as when a petitioner has made a colorable claim but lacks the means to adequately investigate, prepare or present the claim. *Lemeshko*, 325 F. Supp. 2d at 788 (citing *Johnson v. Howard*, 20 F. Supp. 2d 1128, 1129 (W.D. Mich. 1998)); *see also Thirkield v. Pitcher*, 199 F. Supp. 2d 637, 653 (E.D. Mich. 2002) (noting that the appointment of counsel is justified “if, given the difficulty of the case and the litigant’s ability, [he] could not obtain justice without an attorney, [he] could not obtain a lawyer on [his] own, and [he] would have had a reasonable chance of winning with a lawyer at [his] side” (quoting *Forbes v. Edgar*, 112 F.3d 262, 264 (7th Cir. 1997))).

At this stage, it is not clear that Petitioner has a colorable claim for relief or even that his claim is subject to review rather than being barred by the statute of limitations. There is no reason to believe that the case presents any unusual complexities, problems, or conflicts that require the appointment of counsel, and no evidentiary hearing is currently anticipated. Petitioner offers no extraordinary reason—or any reason at all—for requiring the assistance of counsel at this point. Because Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the interests of justice require appointment of counsel at this time, his motion (Doc. No. 9) is **DENIED**, without prejudice to his ability to raise the issue again should circumstances warrant, or the Court’s ability to raise the issue itself.

It is so **ORDERED**.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "William L. Campbell, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

---

WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE